| | Case 1:24-cv-00309-KES-CDB Docur | ment 28 | Filed 10/17/25 | Page 1 of 2 | |
|----------|---|---------|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| <i>3</i> | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | ANTHONY JEROME LAWS, | Ca | se No. 1:24-cv-0030 | 09-KES-CDB (SS) | |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | | ORDER ON MOTION | FOR STATUS | |
| 13 | v. | | CONFERENCE (Doc. 27) | | |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, | (De | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | Defendant. | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | Plaintiff Anthony Jerome Laws ("Plaintiff") seeks judicial review of an administrative | | | | |
| 19 | decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Plaintiff's claim for disability benefits | | | | |
| 20 | under the Social Security Act. (Doc. 1). | | | | |
| 21 | On October 7, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion in which he states that it has been over 11 | | | | |
| 22 | months since he filed his optional reply brief (Doc. 24) and the Court has not yet ruled on the | | | | |
| 23 | pending motion for summary judgment. See (Doc. 27). He cites to Federal Rules of Civil | | | | |
| 24 | Procedure 16, 26, and 29 to 37 for his request that the Court set a status conference. <i>Id.</i> at 1. | | | | |
| 25 | The Court notes that none of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure cited by Plaintiff entitle | | | | |
| 26 | Plaintiff to seek a status conference with the Court based on the time between completion of | | | | |
| 27 | motion briefing and the Court's ruling. The undersigned is unaware of any other authority that | | | | |
| 28 | would be applicable here. | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Case 1:24-cv-00309-KES-CDB Document 28 Filed 10/17/25 Page 2 of 2

As the Court explained in its earlier order on Plaintiff's previous request for a status update (Doc. 26), the Eastern District of California is one of the busiest courts in the country and remains under a judicial emergency. Significant delays are regrettable but unavoidable under the circumstances and the pending motion will be resolved as soon as is practicable given the Court's tremendous workload.

Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, Plaintiff's motion for status conference (Doc. 27), construed as a motion for status, is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 16, 2025

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE